



GREENSBORO URBAN AREA Metropolitan Planning Organization

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of May 28, 2003

3:00 p.m. Greensboro, NC

Blue Room

(County Commissioners' Briefing Room)

Old Guilford County Courthouse

TAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Carmany	TAC Chair
Doug Galyon	NC Board of Transportation
Robbie Perkins	<i>Greensboro City Council</i>
Keith Holliday	<i>Mayor of Greensboro</i>
Jim Westmoreland	<i>TCC Chair</i>
Bob Landreth	Guilford County Board of Commissioners
Don Vaughan	<i>Greensboro City Council</i>

ATTENDANCE

Tom Martin	Greensboro Planning Dept.	Mary Fabrizio	Citizen
Scott Rhine	PART	Patty Jessup	Citizen
John Hunsinger	NCDOT Division 7	Robert Huey	Citizen
Fred Fontana	Guilford Co. Transportation	Kim Lilly	Citizen
S. Frank Wyatt	GSO Eng. & Inspections	Jim Martineau	Citizen
Mark E. Kirstner	Guilford Co. Planning Dept.	Jim Kilpatrick	Citizen
Tyler Meyer	GDOT/MPO	Clarence Hailey	Citizen
Jeff Sovich	GDOT/MPO	Glenda Hailey	Citizen
Scott Walston	NCDOT – Statewide Planning	Mark Lichtenberger	Citizen
Peggy Holland	GDOT/MPO	Jerry Bennett	Citizen
Adam Fischer	GDOT/MPO	Jake Webb	Citizen
Paul Muschick	<i>News & Record</i>	Erol Yurtkuran	Citizen
Allen Purser	Greensboro Chamber of Commerce	Lisa Yurtkuran	Citizen
Craig McKinney	GDOT	Sarah Brubaker	Citizen



GREENSBORO URBAN AREA Metropolitan Planning Organization

Benjamin Julian
Bruce Bunce

NC A&T State University
Citizen

Bill Brubaker
Chris Rhodes

Citizen
Emert Reporting, Inc.

Sandy Carmany called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Action Items

1. Approve Minutes of April 23, 2003

Bob Landreth moved for approval of the minutes. Don Vaughan seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes as prepared.

2. Proposed Thoroughfare Plan Amendments

Tyler Meyer stated that the Proposed Thoroughfare Plan Amendments were developed through the work conducted on the Airport Area Transportation Study, which was a cooperative effort between the MPO, and a range of other regional planning partners, including PART, NCDOT, Guilford County Planning, and the other MPOs in the area. The study was conducted over the last couple of years, with technical work led by Scott Walston. Scott Walston was assisted by a Project Steering Committee, which included representatives from the several agencies that were involved. The study demonstrates the need for new freeway connections in the airport area. The identified connections include: a freeway connection from I-40 / Business I-40 to NC 68, then carrying I-73 to the Greensboro Western Urban Loop via Bryan Boulevard; a freeway connection from Forsyth County to the proposed I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector; and a freeway extension of Sandy Ridge Road from West Market Street to the interchange of the proposed I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector with the proposed Forsyth Airport Connector. The need for these facilities were based on mobility and access in the airport area and the entire region in future years. Without these facilities, such as I-40 and NC 68, they would reach unacceptable levels of gridlock conditions in future years.

The study also looked at alternative routing configurations for these facilities and alternative interchange locations. Sixteen alternatives were developed in that process. These were narrowed down to four alternatives, which were included in the handout material given to the Committee. A final recommendation was made for the proposed corridors, and the recommendations were based, first and foremost on technical assessments of what would yield the most efficient movement of traffic in future years. This means that the heaviest traffic flows are served with the shortest, most direct routes. The study sought to minimize negative impacts of the facilities in future years, including impacts to the environment, such as wetlands and stream crossings, historic and archaeological resources, and existing communities. Public comments received through the public review process, were also considered when making these recommendations. The study has taken a macroscopic view of the issues in the area at this time.

These amendments will allow further study to proceed on the identified corridors. In order for these amendments to become official they must be adopted by the TAC and the Board of Transportation. This would allow the next steps in the process to proceed. The first step would involve evaluating these connections through the Long Range Transportation Plan update, which will be conducted over the next year, and will allow an examination of the surface street connection needs in the area, as well as a re-evaluation of the configurations of the freeway-level routes if warranted. In the midterm, the goal would be to enter the environmental phase. This would provide a microscopic evaluation of these proposed facilities and would look at, in great detail, the purpose and need for the projects to determine if they are needed, as previously indicated. It would also look

at the environmental impacts in an effort to provide a route and facility configuration that would meet the transportation needs, while minimizing negative

impacts. The environmental review process will culminate with the issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD), which would determine whether these facilities may move forward. There are certain contingencies for entering the environmental phase. First, funding to support the study needs to be identified, which could take a considerable amount of time. It is recommended that a priority be placed on advancing this alternative to the environmental study phase as soon as possible.

Given the level of planning that has been done, the development ordinance implications of amending the Thoroughfare Plan would include several fairly minimal restrictions. There would be no effect on already approved developments, new site plan development, uses of land, or sales of property. Future subdivision development, and conditional use rezonings could be required to place a note on the plat, development plan, or deed, indicating the anticipated location of the corridor. Also, in cases where there is adequate space on an affected parcel to achieve a comparable level of development, while accommodating the freeway corridor, right-of-way dedication could be required.

The amendments to the Thoroughfare Plan are based on the findings and recommendations of the Airport Area Transportation Study (AATS), although staff recommendations include several deviations from those of the study. The first recommended amendment adds the proposed I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector corridor. Staff recommend that in the vicinity of Cude Road, this corridor be shifted to the south. This would reduce the number of residential properties in the Quail Creek neighborhood that would be crossed by the corridor, as it is shown in the AATS.

The second recommended amendment adds the proposed Forsyth Airport Connector corridor to the Thoroughfare Plan. Staff also recommend retaining the extension of Bryan Boulevard, contrary to the recommendations of the AATS. It recommended deleting the Bryan Boulevard extension to Pleasant Ridge Road. At this point, the staff recommends keeping that extension. The reason for the recommendation is that we have envisioned conducting an analysis of the surface street activity needs under the Long Range Transportation Plan update, which would resolve whether the extension would be needed. The final determination will be made after further studies are conducted.

The third recommendation is to add the Sandy Ridge Road Extension corridor, and to delete the Sandy Ridge Road / Pleasant Ridge Road Connector, which is currently shown on the Thoroughfare Plan. In addition, staff recommend that the section of Sandy Ridge Road, from I-40 to Market Street, be reclassified as a major thoroughfare. Currently, this facility is classified as a local street. The reason for this change is evident in the need for Sandy Ridge Road to be extended northward to meet the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector and the Forsyth Airport Connector, rather than north-eastward to Pleasant Ridge Road, which would be overburdened by the resulting traffic.

Of the four final alternatives that were the basis of the recommendations of the AATS, Alternative 2 was selected because it serves the primary traffic flow in a direct and efficient manner. The corridor from I-40/Business 40 to NC 68 and I-73 has been estimated to have volume of approximately 70,000 vehicles per day. By serving the dominant or highest traffic volumes with the shortest routes, the greatest traffic benefits are achieved, which in turn minimizes air pollution because fewer miles would be traveled.

Another benefit of Alternative 2 is that it provides a smooth movement for I-73 traffic through the study area. That's in contrast to Alternative Number 4, which would have routed the I-40/Business 40 connector to join the existing Bryan Boulevard.

Alternative 2 also has lower costs than the other alternatives and appears relatively effective at minimizing other impacts. These impacts are summarized on page 6 in the "Comparison Matrix" of the handout. The comparison shows that Alternative 2 did as well or better than the other alternatives in a majority of categories. Alternative 2 did particularly well in the categories of cost, distance and wetlands. It had a comparable number of residential relocations and business relocations anticipated as the other alternatives.

Another factor contributing to the selection of Alternative 2, is that it supports land use planning goals, more effectively than Alternatives 1 and 3. Both the Airport Area Plan and the Western Guilford Area Plan called for keeping commercial and industrial development further south with primarily residential development occurring in stages in the north. These goals would encounter conflicts if any of the other alternatives were selected.

One factor that is unlike the other findings of the AATS, is in regard to the public comments received. Most commenters preferred alternatives other than Alternative 2. A public meeting was held on April the 24th and there was a public comment that followed over the subsequent month. Approximately 150 people attended the meeting and approximately 106 written comments were received. The comments expressed a wide range of concerns. Some of the concerns included: local roadway access, impacts to property value and ability to sell affected properties, and disruption of the peaceful countryside. There were also concerns regarding need for the Forsyth County Airport connector. Concerns were also expressed about the cost estimation procedures for housing relocations. There were concerns that Alternative 2 appears to cross the most densely populated areas and several areas that have recently been approved for development.

Among the comments received, 76 commenters specifically recommended Alternative 3. Also, there was a significant number of people who, although they preferred Alternative 4, supported Alternative 3 instead, because Alternative 4 was not feasible. Six comments supported Alternative 4, while four comments supported Alternative 2. There were also resolutions of support from Winston-Salem-Forsyth MPO and PART regarding the process in general, without reference to specific alternatives. The Winston-Salem Journal also published an editorial in support of the process of planning for the region's future. This round of citizen comments was in contrast to the comments submitted in response to the first AATS public meeting. Among those comments, sixty-eight supported Alternative 4, forty-seven supported Alternative 3, and six supported Alternative 2. It is noteworthy that a significant number of those commenters were from the Winston-Salem area, whereas in the second comment period, the commenters represented an area more closely surrounding the airport.

The task now at hand in this process is the approval of the proposed amendments by the TAC, which would then be followed up with approval by the Board of Transportation. Incorporating these amendments into the Thoroughfare plan is required in order for them to be eligible for further study. The amendments would then be able to enter the environmental study process, in which the TAC and Board of Transportation will have an opportunity to set priorities for what issues the environmental document will examine. It is likely that for detailed analysis, these corridors would be divided into smaller segments to be studied one at a time. The staff recommends that the TAC, NCDOT and our regional partners place a high priority on secured the funding necessary to advance these corridors to the environmental study stage. Obtaining this funding could take at

least 2 to 2 years, while study itself could require 5 to 7 years and would involve the review and concurrence of various resource agencies and ultimately approval by the Federal Highway Administration through a record of decision. Once the record of decision is issued, the project would be able to advance to the transportation improvement

program, at which point the TAC and the Board of Transportation would then need to evaluate these proposed facilities in the context of the other transportation priorities in the area.

The recommended action today is for the TAC to approve this set of amendments as presented.

Robbie Perkins stated that the purpose of today's action is to put an alternative on the table that could be prioritized through evaluation against the other alternatives that are already on the table, and over a five to seven year period of time, there will be a final alternative selected. Tyler Meyer confirmed this statement and explained that the environmental study process would look at multiple alternatives, most likely the other alternatives identified in this study. Don Vaughan asked what the anticipated date would be for completion of the proposed facilities. Tyler Meyer advised that completion of these facilities would take approximately 20 to 25 years, but that some sections could be completed prior to that time. Jim Westmoreland commented that the completion also depends on available funding for this project.

Sandy Carmany asked if and when the studies are completed, whether the recommended projects would then be considered alongside the other projects already on the TIP. Jim Westmoreland agreed and commented that the only exception to that would be if there was some special legislation written by the General Assembly or Congress for funding these facilities.

Robbie Perkins asked whether the alternative selection process eliminates one at a time, or instead one final alternative is chosen at the end of the study. Jim Westmoreland explained that this process recommends to the TAC a set of preferred corridor options to place on the Thoroughfare Plan. The next step will be to pursue the funding for additional planning and environmental work. During the environmental impact study phase, the resource agencies would review each alternative, identify other potential alignments, and then evaluate the impacts of each corridor in order to develop a final alignment as the recommended corridor from that study. Mayor Keith Holliday asked why the TAC should choose an alternative now if all 16 alternatives would be studied again before making a final determination. He asked if this study procedure was a DOT policy. Jim Westmoreland advised that under state law, a specific corridor alignment must be included on the Thoroughfare Plan in order to pursue the funding needed to advance to the next level of planning.

Don Vaughan asked if the recommended Thoroughfare Plan amendment action would trigger a formal notice of roadway corridor to alert residents that a roadway may be developed on or adjacent to particular property. Tyler Meyer advised that that would happen once the environmental study phase is initiated.

Scott Walston presented aerial photographs showing the protection of the Benjamin Parkway corridor and stated if the alignment can be preserved, then residential homes could be saved in years to come by preventing development within the corridor. The purpose of selecting an alternative for amending the Thoroughfare Plan is to establish a preferred alignment, enabling the protection of that alignment from future development. Over time, other alignments will become less attractive as alternatives because they will have been obstructed by subsequent development. There are no guarantees that the alignments chosen today will be agreeable to the environmental agencies 5 or 10 years from now, but we are making every effort to select the best alternative. Sandy Carmany clarified that although today's Thoroughfare Plan amendment is not set in stone, it is receiving the MPO's "seal of approval," whether we agree with the process or not.

Sandy Carmany advised that she met with several residents of various neighborhoods in this area and offered them approximately 15 minutes to express their concerns during the meeting.

(Please see attached handout of Bruce Bunce's comments and concerns.)

Sandy Carmany thanked Bruce Bunce for his remarks and for being very professional during this whole process.

Don Vaughan stated that all members of the TAC either live in the city or on the other side of town. He stated in 12 years, this is the first public meeting he has attended in which this has been the case. Mayor Keith Holliday remarked that too often citizens do not get involved in local government until it affects them. He stated that he was glad to see so many citizens in attendance, especially since some mentioned that it is their first involvement in government.

Mayor Holliday asked if projections of the numbers of cars that would travel on the various segments of the of the recommended alternative have been completed. Jim Westmoreland advised that those projections were included in the assessment of each alternative. Mayor Holliday asked what percentage of the total traffic handled by these corridors would be travelling on the section of the proposed I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector between Marshall Smith Road and Bryan Boulevard, as compared to the percentage of total traffic volume on the Forsyth Airport Connector. Scott Walston informed the Committee that in 2025:

- 29,000 vehicles would travel the Sandy Ridge Road Extension;
- 49,000 vehicles would travel from the I-40 / Business 40 split to the interchange near Marshall Smith Road;
- 61,000 vehicles should travel on the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector from the interchange near Marshall Smith Road to NC 68;
- 68,000 vehicles should travel on the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector from NC 68 to Bryan Boulevard;
- 22,000 vehicles would travel on the Forsyth Airport Connector from the Forsyth County line to the interchange near Marshall Smith Road; and
- That the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector would divert approximately 30,000 vehicles per day from I-40.

Robbie Perkins asked what would happen if a vehicle could not make the connection from the I-40 / Business 40 split to the airport. Scott Walston advised that there is no reason that that connection cannot be made. The major obstacle at this point is the historic property on Cude Road that is dictating a lot of the alternative alignments. Robbie Perkins asked how long the site has been a historic property. Tyler Meyer advised that this site, which involves a total of approximately 30 acres, has been a historic property since 1986.

Mayor Holliday asked what the traffic volume projection for the I-73 corridor is, in comparison to the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector. Scott Walston stated that he did not have that information with him. Mayor Holliday remarked that if that number is not 40,000 or more vehicles per day, then aligning the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector along a northern route does not seem justified, since it would not give precedence to the higher traffic route. He suggested that the segment of the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector between Marshall Smith Road and NC 68 could be deleted and replaced with a connection between Marshall Smith Road and the Bryan Boulevard Extension. He also suggested that if the

projected traffic volume on the I-73 corridor is low enough, the portion of the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector between NC 68 and Bryan Boulevard could likewise be deleted. He stated that Alternative 2 is his least preferred of the four alternatives because it does not serve the highest traffic volume with as short a route as does Alternative 4. Alternative 4, in his opinion, would be the least expensive because it involves the least new infrastructure, and would impact fewer properties. Scott Walston advised that such a configuration was considered during the AATS as Alternative H. This alternative was eliminated from consideration because it would result in what the study team perceived as an awkward movement for the I-73 corridor.

Robbie Perkins asked how the City of Winston-Salem feels about these alignments. Jim Westmoreland stated that a resolution of support for the study process has been received from both the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County MPO, as well as the Piedmont Authority for Regional Transportation. He added that in light of the participation of the cities, counties, MPOs, and other jurisdictions, the TAC can act with confidence that our regional partners have been adequately represented in the process. Robbie Perkins remarked that Winston-Salem's support for the recommendations will be instrumental in pursuing the necessary funding for these corridors. Robbie Perkins also asked whether there has been any alternate plan for what route I-73 will follow as it enters the area, because he is concerned about the potential impacts of future I-73 traffic on the planned Urban Loop. Jim Westmoreland advised that from the assessment of the various alternatives, the I-73 study committee is comfortable with the proposed alignment of I-73 down NC 68 to Bryan Boulevard and east to the Urban Loop, that there will be sufficient capacity to accommodate this movement. Tyler Meyer advised that the AATS recommended deleting the Bryan Boulevard Extension, in connection with Alternative Number 2. Staff recommend retaining this extension at this time to allow further evaluation of the connection. Robbie Perkins stated that he foresees industrial or business growth in this area over the next 20 to 25 years, rather than residential growth. Mark Kirstner remarked that the area between the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector and NC 68 appears to be the most likely place for commercial and industrial development and although Alternative 4 might have advantages for economic development regionally, Alternative 2 is better suited for promoting economic development on a more local level because it leaves open larger area that is not crossed by a controlled access facility.

Sandy Carmany asked which alternative was the close choice to Alternative 2, and why that was the case. Jim Westmoreland stated that it was Alternative 3. The key difference between the two alternatives was the preference of some of the Committee members from Forsyth County/Winston-Salem for a more direct connection from the west to the airport. Alternative 3 provides a more direct access into the airport than does Alternative 2, however, the recommendation that ultimately came out of the study team was for Alternative 2, because it best met the objectives of the agencies that were involved in the study process. That recommendation was unanimously endorsed by the TCC today.

Bob Landreth stated that he disagreed with Robbie Perkins and Mark Kirstner, and felt that there would be more residential development in this area than industrial or commercial development. Mayor Holliday and Robbie Perkins responded that this would occur only if Guilford County allowed such development in the area, highlighting the importance of land use planning and regulation in ensuring that various types of development occur in appropriate locations. Bob Landreth stated that evaluation of the local connections should be made an immediate priority.

Mayor Holliday stated that the presentation materials indicate that Alternative 4 would impact 35 homes, but that none of these affected homes is evident in the aerial photograph. Scott Walston explained that the affected homes are obscured by the thickness of the line that marks the proposed corridor.

Mayor Keith Holliday made a motion to amend the thoroughfare plan by adding a modified version of Alternative 4 that would add the portion of the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector between NC 68 and Bryan Boulevard, as proposed in Alternative 2. Doug Galyon commented that the purpose of the meeting today is to send forth a proposed thoroughfare plan amendment to the DOT. A second for the motion was not forthcoming. Therefore, Sandy Carmany asked for another motion.

Bob Landreth made a motion for Alternative 2 as the proposed thoroughfare plan amendment then withdrew the motion.

Don Vaughan moved to eliminate Alternative 1 from further consideration. Bob Landreth seconded the motion. The motion carried with 4 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

Don Vaughan seconded Mayor Holliday's earlier motion for a modified Alternative 4. Mayor Holliday commented that he would advise the County Commissioners not to promote further residential development around the airport area. The motion failed with 2 votes in favor and 3 opposed.

Don Vaughan moved for approval of Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. Bob Landreth seconded the motion. The Committee approved the motion with 4 votes in favor and 1 opposed, to accept Alternative 2 as the official recommendation.

Tyler Meyer advised that the next step would be for the Board of Transportation to review and consider approval of the recommended amendments, which would occur within the next two months. It would then be included through the Long Range Transportation Plan update process. The MPO, NCDOT, and the other regional partners place a priority on entering the environmental study phase as soon as possible. Mayor Holliday commented that he would push for any efforts to create any further funding sources to get the project implemented, to include at minimum the I-40 / NC 68 / I-73 Connector.

(A brief recess in the meeting was taken at this time and Mayor Holliday left the meeting.)

Business Items

1. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program FY 2004-2010

Jeff Sovich stated that this item has arisen from FHWA's newly articulated process for adoption of the MTIP. Federal regulations require that the MTIP be accompanied by a conformity determination report. The conformity determination report is primarily a statement by the MPO and NCDOT that the program of projects in the MTIP is consistent with the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, as well as the current conformity analysis. If throughout the process of developing the MTIP, the schedule of a regionally significant project is adjusted such that it crosses a horizon year, or if a new project of regional significance is added to the program, it's likely that a new conformity analysis would be needed in order to be able to adopt the MTIP. However, in any case, the MTIP needs to conform before it can be adopted.

This document simply says, “Yes, we’ve gone through the inter-agency process, evaluated the MTIP as it is, and it appears to conform to both Long Range Transportation Plan and the conformity analysis.”

Through this process, there were concerns raised by the inter-agency team, which includes NCDOT, NCDENR, FHWA, FTA and EPA. But in the review of the MTIP, the MPO was able to clarify and explain the points of concern those agencies had, and they acknowledged that the MTIP was in fact conforming.

The conformity determination report is required to be available for a minimum 30-day public review and comment period. That period began May 21st and will extend through June 20th. Once the public review and comment period is completed, the public comments and MPO responses to those comments will be incorporated into the document, and the final MTIP and conformity determination report will be adopted by the TAC in June, with adoption by the Board of Transportation in July.

2. NC Moving Ahead!

John Hunsinger of NCDOT, Division 7 advised the Committee that this program is a very ambitious statewide program. This program will allow the State to sell bonds to borrow \$700 million from the highway trust fund to pay for projects that would previously have been paid for with cash. The bonds were approved for sale several years ago, but have not been sold. We're now taking advantage of these bond to generate capital. The key point is that this is a two-year program. Eligible projects include modernization, safety improvements, strengthening, and structural rehabilitation, but the selected routes must not involve right-of-way acquisition, utility problems, or environmental problems.

A lot of response has been received from the five counties in Division 7, which has been given an allocation of \$23.5 million for fiscal year 2004 and an allocation of \$31.5 million for fiscal year 2005. There will be an attempt to select one project from each county during both years of the program for Division 7. A portion of the money will be delegated to replacement of mostly rural type bridges in trying to improve the safety or capacity, at an average of approximately \$500,000 per bridge.

Candidate projects have been received from local governmental agencies, MPOs, and RPOs, throughout the five county area. The projects are currently being evaluated to see which ones meet the criteria on an overall basis. After the projects are selected, a list will be submitted to the chief engineer in Raleigh by June 15th for his review and comments. The scoping process will be performed while waiting for approval from the chief engineer. The scoping process for both years' projects must be submitted to Raleigh by August 1st. Authorization for the projects should be received from the chief soon thereafter. Once approval is given to proceed, the governmental agencies will be notified. February, 2004 is the target date to let the first year's projects to contract.

Gregg Danzer asked if projects could still be submitted. John Hunsinger advised that the Division is still accepting project requests.

3. Guilford County Transportation Department Update

(This item will be presented at a later date.)

4. MPO Strategic Reports

Craig McKinney advised that the NC Rail Division held a meeting on Tuesday, May 27th regarding the traffic separation study for the rail line. They will be repeating that meeting again Thursday evening from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. at Gibsonville Elementary School. They are identifying some near term, mid-term and long-term projects that span over a time period of two to ten years. Public comments are due to the rail division by June 10th. A public hearing will held in July of 2003.

An informal public hearing will be held for the Hilltop Road project on June 2nd. The meeting will be held at Gate City Baptist Church. They will be presenting a compliance to widen Hilltop Road to a five-lane facility with a sidewalk on the south side. The meeting will be held from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. Jim Westmoreland noted that it matches the City's project to widen from Penn Oak to Adams Farm Parkway. It will provide a multi-lane section through that area.

The Battleground Rail Trail project is currently under development by the consultant to establish preliminary designs of the trail. A public meeting will be held on June 26 at Lawndale Baptist Church from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Other Items

1. Board Member Report

Doug Galyon stated that the section of I-40 between Holden Road and Chimney Rock Road would be completed slightly later than anticipated due to defective asphalt. The portion from Chimney Rock Road to Sandy Ridge Road is scheduled for the end of the year, and is still on schedule. The Western Urban Loop from I-40 to Bryan Boulevard will be let to contract in July, with completion scheduled for 2006. The section of the Urban Loop from I-85 to I-40 will be let to contract in November, with a 2006 completion date. The US 29 resurfacing in Guilford County is scheduled to be complete in October of 2004.

2. Reports, Concerns, and Discussion from MPO Area Towns

Gregg Danzer informed the Committee that he's received comments from residents of the Hunters Ridge community and from Town Council members regarding interest in making Ridgpoint Drive a part of the Thoroughfare Plan or connecting it to US 421. Jim Westmoreland advised that he is not aware of any plans, but will ask NCDOT and send him a letter with their response.

3. Regional Transportation News

Sandy Carmany advised that studies continue to identify the corridors for potential regional commuter rail and/or bus rapid transit.

Tyler Meyer stated that the regional model team is currently engaged in the consultant selection process for socio-economic forecasting. This is a major component of the model update and it is important that it be done properly.

4. Wrap-Up

Robbie Perkins asked if it would be possible to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Hicone Road and Rankin Mill Road. It's not in the City, but very near City limits. Doug Galyon stated that a flasher could be installed at that intersection and asked John Hunsinger to investigate the matter.

Jim Westmoreland informed the Committee that the grand re-opening ceremony for the Depot would be held Friday, August 29th at 10:00 a.m. The ceremony will be from 10:00 a.m. to Noon. All TAC members will receive an invitation to the ceremony. A community open house will be held Saturday, August 30th from 9:00 to 3:00 p.m.

The TAC adjourned at 5:04 p.m.